

N00204.AR.002635
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

PARTNERING TEAM MEETING MINUTES BETWEEN 30 NOVEMBER AND 2 DECEMBER
2010 NAS PENSACOLA FL
11/30/2010
NAS PENSACOLA

NAS Pensacola Partnering Team Meeting Minutes
November 30 & December 2, 2010
Pensacola, Florida

ATTENDEES:

Team Members:

| | |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Patty Marajh-Whittemore | NAVFAC |
| Greg Fraley | USEPA |
| Dave Grabka | FDEP |
| Sam Naik | CH2M Hill |
| Hector Hernandez | CH2M Hill |
| Greg Campbell | NASP PWD |
| Gerry Walker | Tetra Tech |

Support Members:

| | |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------|
| John Schoolfield | NAVFAC (Day 1 pm) |
| Frank Lesesne | Tetra Tech |
| Ron Kotun | Tetra Tech |
| Amber Igoe | Tetra Tech – Scribe |
| Stephanie Carroll | The Management Edge – Facilitator |
| Patrick Owens | RASO (Day 1) |
| Boris Dykin | Tetra Tech (Day 2 call-in) |

MINUTES:

1. 1st Day Check In/Opening Remarks/Resource Sharing/Head Count and Proxies/Guests/Review Ground Rules /Review Consensus Items & Action Items & Parking Lot/Approve Minutes (8:11-9:15 am)

The Partnering Team completed check-in and then reviewed the Team Charter and Ground Rules. The Team then reviewed consensus items, updated the Action Item List, and reviewed the parking lot items from the September 2010 meeting. The updated Action Item List is attached to these minutes. All Action Items from the September 2010 meeting were discussed. Completed and ongoing Action Items were noted.

Resource Sharing: Patty M. mentioned the Navy is hosting the RITS Conference December 7, 2010 in Jacksonville, which will be heavily focused on vapor intrusion. Dave G. spoke of FDEP computer virus that has crippled the agency.

Head Count: Missing Allison Harris, Helen Lockard and Brian Caldwell. Guests are Patrick Owens with RASO. Next meeting will be held February 22 & 23 2011, in Pensacola, Florida.

September Action Items Review:

A-030910 Dave G. reviewed SRCO proposal for UST Site 1107 and doesn't agree with the argument. Dave G. believes a monitoring well should have been placed in the source area to see if the area still has groundwater contamination after the soil excavation was conducted. The source area has shown that the contamination isn't mobile, but the groundwater still might meet Risk Management Option (RMO) 2. Dave G. doesn't necessarily agree that the wells sampled were directly down gradient from the source area. The contractor WRS used large diameter augers for soil removal of the Bunker C fuel oil. WRS recommended NFA because Bunker C is not a petroleum regulated product under Chapter 62-770 FAC, Dave G. does not agree with their recommendation because although Bunker C is not covered under the petroleum regulations, Bunker C is a pollutant, so it is covered under the hazardous waste regulations (Chapter 62-780 FAC)

so therefore the contamination still needs to be addressed. Patty M. wanted to know if under RMO2 is a source area monitoring well needed. Dave G. responded, yes but if that well is clean then an NFA will be issued if; however, since soil contamination remains at depth a conditional SRCO will be needed for soil. Dave G. proposed a year of groundwater monitoring, but cannot confirm existence of the plume because there is no source well in place. Dave G. recommended putting the item in Parking Lot for end of meeting.

A-040910 Greg C. spoke with Ed regarding use of the flight simulator for a team building exercise. The simulators are down and it doesn't look like we'll be able to use it this year, but perhaps next year.

A-050910 Greg C. sent email to Dave G. with pictures regarding fishing pressure in marina. Greg C. has moved RAB meeting from 6:00 pm to 5:30 pm this evening.

A-080910 Helen L. is absent.

A-150910 Greg C. took pictures of marina no fishing signs and sent to Dave G.

Meeting Minutes

Gerry W. passed out the September 2010 NAS Pensacola Partnering Team meeting minutes. Patty M. had comments on page 3, the site number should be Site 15 not Site 13. Also in Paragraph 3 the sentence on OU 2 needs to be revised and rewritten as follows: "Surface soil will be removed 2 feet below land surface."

Sam N. said that Site 30 should be changed to site 30G and that the DMSO trailer should be DRMO at Site 12 not Site 30G.

Dave G. would like to review the minutes before consensus is taken, he will review them tonight and be able to discuss them tomorrow.

Stephanie had originally prepared a team member exit training session but because of Allison's absence she will put something else together for tomorrow. The topic will be "2010 accomplishments" this may also support the preparation of the CNO Award.

2. Break (9:15-9:32)

3. RAB Presentation Discussion (9:32-10:32)

RAB Presentation will be held tonight at 5:30, Gerry W. distributed hardcopies of the presentation the Proposed Plan for Site 45-Building 603 Lead Site.

Greg F. indicated that there will not be a new lawyer reviewing Proposed Plans for EPA as he had previously indicated. Dave Buxbaum will continue to be the EPA reviewer. Patty M. and Dave G. asked how much risk there could be if Proposed Plans were sent out for public comment without having them reviewed by the EPA lawyer. Greg F. said he should know in the next 30 days when the Site 44 and 45 Proposed Plans will be reviewed and where the Proposed Plans stand by the end of January. Greg F. suggested sending out the Proposed Plans for public review since the remedy will not be changed.

Gerry W. said that Site 46 Proposed Plan will be submitted for review the beginning of 2011, in addition to the review of Sites 44 and 45.

Gerry W. then ran through the Power Point Presentation (attached).

A-011210 Greg C. will begin process for repairing damaged sewer line at OU11 Site 38 to eliminate parking lot flooding.

Greg C. mentioned that storm water permit for NFWMD will need to be added to remedial design.

4. Break (10:34-10:47)

5. SMP Gantt Chart, SCAP, and Exit Strategy (10:47-11:30 pm)

Patty M. stated that every time there needs to be an extension added to the Gantt Chart an extension letter will be required. If an extension is required, a letter will be sent to the Regulators asking for a 30 day extension and the Regulators need to respond with a yes or a no. If the answer is no, then the agencies will enter into “informal dispute resolution”. The Draft Feasibility Study for Site 41 was supposed to be published on November 30, 2010, a letter was written asking for 30 day extension. Dave G. has approved the extension, but will need to send an approval letter. Patty M. asked Dave G. to send an approval letter for the Site 41 Feasibility Study extension and asked if he can respond to an upcoming extension request for Site 46 Proposed Plan without having to send an extension letter. Dave G. and Greg F. agreed with extending the due date for Site 46 Proposed Plan from the original draft due date of December 15, 2010. Patty M. and Gerry W. will write an extension letter for the Site 46 Proposed Plan. Gerry W. believes that three draft documents will be submitted this fiscal year including: the Site 41 Feasibility Study, the Site 46 Proposed Plan and the OU 11 Site 38 Remedial Design which was sent out November 29, 2010. As specified in the FFA, the Regulators have 90 days to review draft documents, if they do not review it within that time frame they have to submit an extension letter asking for an additional 30 days to comment. If Regulators do not send an extension letter, the document is approved without comment.

A-021210 Gerry W./Patty M. will write an additional extension letter for Site 46 Proposed Plan and submit it to the Regulators

A-031210 Gerry W. will email the final SMP on Dec 1st

A-041210 Dave G. and Greg F. will approve final SMP and approve an additional extension letter for Site 41 Feasibility Study

Dave G. stated that the Gantt Chart will need to be changed for Site 41. Gerry W. said that updated Gantt charts will be submitted along with the SMP and will continue to be modified with actual dates. Patty M. proposed a working Gantt Chart for the Partnering Team and an original Gantt Chart that is locked in with SMP each fiscal year. Gerry W. said Navy due dates and Regulatory due dates will also need to be included and that emails will be sent to the Partnering Team to remind everyone of the due dates. Dave G. wanted to double check the FFA to see if e-mails count as “in writing”.

Consensus Item 1: The Team approves the Final SMP without changes.

Consensus Item 2: A working Gantt chart, based on the SMP, will be maintained for the Team and updated at each Partnering Team meeting.

Consensus Item 3: SMP time extensions can be requested and approved via email.

6. **Lunch (Greg C. and Gerry W. RAB Prep) (11:35-1:27 pm)**
7. **Continue SMP Gantt Chart, SCAP and Exit Strategy (1:27-2:40 pm)**

OU 1

The Draft Annual Monitoring Report will go out January 2011 and the final will be issued in October 2011. A quarterly monitoring event was conducted approximately two weeks ago, it was noted that a couple of monitoring wells in the woods have been destroyed. Gerry W. will evaluate if they need to be reinstalled or if nearby wells can be used as replacements.

OU 13 Sites 8 and 24

This site is currently in a “monitoring only” program being completed by Aerostar. Dave G. will comment on the reports received in May and July 2010.

A-051210 Patty M. will look at what has been submitted by Aerostar, determine what is missing and submit them to Dave G. and Greg F. for their review.

OU 4/Site 15

This site is currently in a monitoring only program being completed by Aerostar. The Sampling Report has recently been issued.

A-061210 Patty M. will send Aerostar emails to Gerry W. to add to his “Roses are Red” emails.

OU 2

Internal draft Completion Report has been submitted to the Navy; once it is approved a Draft will be sent to the Regulators, subsequently followed by a Draft Final and Final Report. All reports need to be commented on and reviewed. The Remedial Design is final; UFP-SAP for the Groundwater to Surface water Investigation has been submitted to Dave G. and is awaiting his approval.

OU 11 Site 38

Draft Remedial Design was due November 30, 2010 and was sent to the Regulators on November 29, 2010.

OU 16 Site 41

Patty M. has submitted an extension letter. Draft Feasibility Study has been extended from November 30, 2010 to December 30, 2010. The document is in internal review with the Navy. Dave G. spoke of the risk assessment meeting he attended along with the University of Florida (UF) risk assessors that discussed the topic of apportionment for cleanup. Parties have agreed upon the uptake model, but have yet to decide on the numbers to use in model (e.g. 5 meals per year vs. 52 meals per year). Apportionment will be dropped out of remedial plan. Gerry W. predicts that the Feasibility Study will be

submitted, UF will receive it and EPA risk assessor will have a long list of comments likely including comments on the Remedial Investigation and that there will need to be a special meeting held to discuss the comments with the risk assessors. Comment #9 from risk assessors will need to be addressed regarding number of fish meals eaten in a week.

OU 18 Site 43

Draft Remedial Design was submitted September 20, 2010. This is the highest priority on "Roses are Red" list. Sam N. has requested that it be expedited allowing for the removal of four hot spots once the remedial design has been approved. Dave G. has almost finished his review of the document. Sam N. would like to preserve old growth live oak trees in one of the hot spot areas if possible. Dave G. mentioned that the remedy is to clean up to commercial industrial with lead being the only issue. Dave G. asked Sam N. why is Remediation Area A4 being analyzed for the other COCs but not for lead. Dave G. asked if lead is not being addressed in Remediation Area A4 then what COC is being addressed. Sam N. responded that the A4 area could be where the old growth live oak trees are. Dave G. stated that if the live oak area is to be preserved then ROD will need to be modified. Patty M. asked if sustainability could be added to the ROD and therefore only minimal modifications (e.g. sending out a Fact Sheet to the public for comment) would be needed. Gerry W. asked Sam N. if excavation can be performed with shovels instead of backhoes to remove contamination from the area with trees. Gerry W. said a decision will be made after comments on the Remedial Design are received. Sam N. would like to demonstrate that leaving the contamination in place in the live oak area would not create any additional risk. Sam N. will review the options for sustainability after the comments on the Remedial Design are received.

OU 19 Site 44

The Draft Proposed Plan was submitted June 12, 2010. FDEP's comments have been received, but not EPA's.

OU 20 Site 45

The Draft Proposed Plan was submitted August 12, 2010. The 90 day review period will conclude on December 15, 2010.

OU 21 Site 46

According to the Site Management Plan the Draft Proposed Plan is due December 12, 2010; However the due date is going to be extended.

MMRP Sites

Nothing projected for the remainder of this year. John Schoolfield has gone through the prioritization process and Navy Headquarters will decide which sites get funded.

UST Site 2 Building 2662

All files were presumed lost; the Navy tasked Tetra Tech to perform additional research and they were able to locate the files and determine that lead was the only groundwater COC of concern. Gerry W. indicated that the groundwater sampling event has been completed and none of the groundwater samples had exceedances of lead. The summary report is currently in "internal Navy review" and is waiting on approval before sending to FDEP. A NFA is being requested.

A-071210 Gerry W. will determine what is happening with the SCRO for Site 1107

A-081210 Gerry W. will send Draft SAR Addendum to Patty M. for UST Site 2 Building 2662

Bronson Field 1120

SRCO request was submitted to Tracie on November 3, 2008 requesting RMO2. Dave G. indicated that the wells had not been sampled recently and we should resample the wells to see if a NFA was possible instead of the RMO2. Gerry W. indicated that the first quarterly sampling event was completed and analytical results indicated exceedances in the source area wells. The request for the SRCO is at FDEP and it appears that RMO2 might be needed. Dave G. will review/comment on the SCRO request which will be updated with the most recent sampling event.

A-091210 Dave G. will review/comment on SRCO request for Bronson Field 1120.

Gantt charts will continue tomorrow

8. Break (2:40-2:50)

9. RASO Update (2:50-3:41 pm)

Patrick O. gave a presentation on NAS Pensacola Radium Sites 12, 25 and 27. RASO offers 3-4 courses a month to the Navy on how to manage radioactive materials. RASO is active under Radiological Affairs Support Program (RASP). RASP regulates and controls all naval ionizing radiation sources except for sources that fall under the active nuclear propulsion program, the nuclear weapons and the medical program. Sources include: licensed radioactive material, accelerator produced RAM, naturally occurring RAM, machine sources, Radium 226 & Strontium 90. RASP is managed by strong regulatory oversight and proactive radiological support and program directives. RASO provides the following: support to Navy/Marine corps, BRAC, NRC/NRSC decommissioning, Multi agency radionuclide survey, regulatory interface (fed and local agencies), document review. Standards used for evaluation were discussed. The Work Plan approach has four phases: Phase 1-Planning, Phase 2-Implementation, Phase 3-Assessment Phase 4 Decision Making Phase.

At NAS Pensacola Sites 12 and 27 soil excavation was performed; at Site 25 there was no excavation. Approximately 50 roll offs containers containing contaminated soil was transferred to Idaho. The imported fill has been sampled and was deemed clean. At Site 12 contamination was present, the area was excavated to 2 ft below land surface (bls) and a second set of readings were collected. The readings were still high so now the area will be excavated to 4 ft bls. At Site 27 a small portion of the site was excavated, the site itself is very small site but all the utility lines run through the parking lot.

10. Break (3:41-3:45 pm)

11. MRP Site Update (3:45-4:25 pm)

John Schoolfield gave an update on the MMRP Sites. At NAS Pensacola MMRP Site results include: 4 sites have been granted No Further Action, 10 Sites will still need further action or study (with possibly 4 out of 10 receiving NFA after further study), 2 sites could possibly need LUCs or further study. John S. considers the Skeet and Firing

ranges at Corry Station to be the high priorities because a residential neighborhood is adjacent to the site.

The Saufley Field skeet range scored higher than Corry Station due to high PAH concentrations and the fact that access to the site is not limited. The criteria is dependent on who provides security at the site either the Navy or federal prison staff. A lot of PAH exceedances were detected on Corry Station and scored a 3 on the prioritization list.

At OLF Bronson, the lead is almost delineated but the PAHs still need to be delineated along eastern and southern edge. The detected lead at Saufley Field extends further therefore additional samples will need to be collected, PAH exceedances are also still evident and additional samples will need to be collected. At Saufley Field a, geophysical study has been performed.

John S. wants to explore a PAH bioavailability study for clay target fragments. According to the State's website, clay targets are non-toxic in an aqueous environment and not bio-available. However the broken target fragments are considered solid waste with impacts being limited to the surface. PAH free clay targets are now available. Dave G. stated that the regulations take particle size and the ability to be ingested into consideration. The fragments themselves would not be considered part of media, but if they have degraded, becoming part of the media, they could be ingested or have dermal exposure. According to John S. the MMRP Ranking has three modules: Module 1 explosive hazards, Module 2 chemical warfare hazard, and Module 3 Environmental and Health Hazard. The ranking goes from 1-8 with 1 being highest. Only sites with chemical warfare receive a 1, the highest ranking a site could have without chemical warfare is a 2. John S. has turned in all of scores to headquarters and they have the ability to change the scores if deemed necessary.

The schedule is to conduct supplemental sampling with existing funds during the spring. The budget for FY11 has yet to be appropriated.

12. 1st Day Meeting Closeout-Review Action Items/Consensus Items (4:25-4:28 pm)

Hector H. will give presentation first thing in the morning. Still need to finish petroleum Gantt charts. The team adjourned at 4:30 to attend RAB meeting.

A-101210 Greg C. will add RAB members to the Blue Angels List

13. 2nd Day Check In (8:07-8:16 pm)

Day 2 Check In complete

14. Partnering Team Training (8:16-8:40 am)

Stephanie passed out questionnaire to reflect on Team progress and accomplishments in 2010. Questions included:

- What accomplishments as a team are we most proud of,
- What have we learned together as a team,
- What have we learned about ourselves as a Team Member (this is individual and personal not summarized below)

- What improvements would we like to work on in 2011 and how will they be accomplished?

2010 Team Accomplishments

- David's quick and smooth transition into the Partnering Team
- Site 43 ROD resolution, 1st IROD in NAVFAC SE
- Everyone on Team assisted in resolving issues at OU2, good team effort on UFP-SAP (i.e. quick review and good resolution)
- RASO onboard for OU2
- Completion and resolution of Site Inspection Reports for MMRP sites
- Two Remedies in Place (RIPs) Sites 25 & 27; and UST 17
- Beginning work at Corry Station (initiated IR process at 3 sites) and Saufley Field
- Team Cohesion

What have we learned through working together as Team?

- Team cohesion, no personality issues, trust, respect of intentions and opinions
- Team is good at working through the hard parts (e.g. Site 41)
- Team is not afraid of beating on a dead horse, in case it's not dead
- Learned how to be responsive and reactive to management
- No group think, willing to hit hard points and decision points. True partnering
- Roses are Red" reminders have assisted in streamlining process and it initiates a response

Team improvements for 2011

- Complete Rods for Site 44, 45 and 46
- Complete RIP OU2 and Site 43
- CNO award
- Conditional SRCOs for several petroleum sites

15. Meeting Minutes Approval (8:40-9:06 am)

Dave G. presented comments on September 2010 meeting minutes. Page 3, 2nd paragraph capitalize Navy. Page 4, 5th line, DRMO trailer not DSMO trailer. Page 5, Building 3644 EARN is ERN. Page 7, DOA should be DOD under I-ROD bullet. Page 5th bullet, New Governor will be elected in November 2010. Page 9, #17, 3rd paragraph, Dave G. is not comfortable with the term "impermeable" being used as asphalt is not impermeable. Change direct exposure limits to direct exposure exceedances. Under the selected remedy, in following paragraph, capitalize Cap for RCRA standards. Page 10, #20, change conference to conferenced. Wetland 64 needs re-evaluation (12 meals per year vs. 52 vs. 5 meals) for the fish consumption rate. Page 10, P Regional Goals needs to be Preliminary Remedial Goals (PRGs). Page 11, #21, 390 cubic feet per minute psi, needs at what psi—agreed to leaving 390 cfm and dropped the psi rate. Change conference to conferenced in first sentence. Last paragraph remove space between poly and nuclear and add dioxide after carbon. Page 12, should read Dave G. agreed to the rationale and asked that supporting information be included in the Construction Completion Report. Site 19, naple should be NAPL. Page 13, remove at from 1st paragraph between but and Corry station. Page 14, capitalize VOCs and SVOCs under OU 2. Delete Dave G. is concerned that without surface water some of the GCTL COCs

might go away or be added. Change marine vs. surface to marine vs. fresh, next paragraph change surface water to fresh when comparing to marine. Last page under Facilitator Feedback Tire II to Tier II.

Consensus 04: The September 22 and 23, 2010 meeting minutes have been approved after amended with editorial comments and changes

A-111210 Gerry W. will send the draft of December 2010 meeting minutes and the Final approved September 2010 meeting minutes.

16. SMP Gantt review for Petroleum Sites (9:07-9:55 am)

UST 18 Crash Crew Training Area

Update at 10:45. Boris Dykin will call in for biotrap treatability study presentation.

UST 15 Building 1159

Patty M. received email update on oxidizers regarding monitoring the influent and effluent of the treatment system. Patty M. suggested that Dave G. review the November 29, 2010 e-mail regarding the functionality of the treatment system to meet air regulations.

A-121210 Patty M. will update Dave G. regarding Site UST 15 Bronson 1159 including the effluent flow rate for the treatment system.

UST 20 Site 19 Fuel Farm Pipeline

Hector H. provided update, currently in the field with DPT rig and preliminary data is becoming available. The majority of the points have been implemented; however the rains have limited field work. Characterization is scheduled to be completed by December 31, 2010; Hector H. requested that to be conservative push the due date out to March 31, 2011. The due date for Draft Final RAP was changed from 15 to 45 days, and the FDEP review time was changed from 15 days to 30 days.

UST 21 Site 20 Berthing Pier

The monitoring well installation was completed in November 2010 and the 1st quarter sampling event including sampling the newly installed wells was completed. The plan is to write a RAP addendum pushing for MNA even though free product is present. Dave G. stated that he would be on board if results indicated that the product is not moving into the bay. Data from 1st quarter monitoring event should be ready by the end of December 2010.

UST 22

Comments have been received from Dave G. and one of the comments is that a deeper well needs to be installed because there is nothing between the lead plume and Pensacola Bay to show delineation nor is there down gradient delineation for the TRPH plume. For further assessment Dave G. is requesting a deeper well to show that the lead plume is not discharging under or through seawall into the bay as well as delineating the TRPH plume. Patty M. was concerned that there is not enough funding in the budget for additional well installation and that the CTO is going to expire soon. Another comment by Dave G. was that an additional round of sampling to supplement the 2007 data needs to be collected within 270 days of document submittal. In the surface water, TRPH is the only

contaminant exceeding standards in one plume and lead is the only contaminant exceeding surface water standards in the other plume. Dave G. stated that if submitting a RAP for MNA contaminants exceeding GCTLs (xylenes and possibly ethylbenzene) will have to be addressed. Dave G. stated that the specific issue is the lead exceedances in wells next to seawall. Natural attenuation may work for GCTLs, but the surface water exceedances still need to be addressed.

The TRPH plume has not been delineated so it will be difficult to do RAP. Dave G. has issues with MNA for lead because the wells near seawall have GCTL and Surface water exceedances. Hector H. suggested including decision milestones with what the objective and outcome should be in the RAP for Dave G. to approve to streamline the process. Gerry W. said it will be hard for FDEP to approve MNA in the RAP if we don't have down-gradient well analytical data. Hector H. suggested using DPT points to gather screening data, then in the RAP lay out the line of objectives for permanent sentinel wells. Dave G. stated that he will be able to deal with objectives in the RAP if the Navy can deal with data not coming back as anticipated. Patty M. does not want to have SAR IV; Hector H. suggested calling it a request for supplemental screening data to write the RAP. Patty M. suggested speaking to Mike Singletary. Dave G. said he would handle the site by proposing MNA for TRPH with several down-gradient wells between the plume and the seawall and a vertical well in center of the plume and not go to RAP at this point in time. The SAR can recommend MNA or writing of a RAP and a RAP can recommend active remediation. For the lead plume, Dave G. proposed looking through existing data to see if there was a turbidity issue and look at other lead sites to see what their decision logic was. SAR III proposed MNA for lead and proposed a RAP for TRPH, Dave G. suggested the TRPH plume have an MNA plan (with additional wells to be installed) and for the lead plume to do what has been done with other lead plumes. Dave G. doesn't think we can just monitor based on data he has. Patty M. will need to request funding and write a scope of work.

17. Break (9:54-10:10 am)

18. Continued SMP Gantt review for Petroleum Sites (10:10-10:45 am)

UST 22

Gerry W. gave a recap on Dave G. comments: Number 1: the former tank area doesn't have wells nearby and number 2: there is not deep down gradient delineation. Gerry W. asked Dave G. if he would be receptive to a plan proposing a synopsis of sampling existing wells as well as additional wells to be installed as part of RAP or does he need an additional SAR. Dave G. said his precedent would be Gas Hill at NAS Jacksonville. At that site the data didn't appear to be complete, but a RAP proposing additional wells was written. Dave G. thinks that this line of logic could work pretty well for the TRPH plume and hopefully for lead plume as well. Dave G. is concerned it could be a short lived RAP if MNA for lead cannot be accomplished based on analytical results. Gerry W. suggested setting up a conference call within the next 2 weeks to discuss Dave G.'s comments/concerns. Dave G. doesn't expect the TRPH to be very mobile and wants to delineate the plume and put into MNA plan. For lead, the surface water GCTL is lower than the groundwater which could hinder MNA.

A-131210 Gerry W. will set up conference call within the next 2 weeks with Patty W. and Dave G. to discuss UST Site 22

UST 24 Sherman Field Fuel Farm

The time frame for Draft Final RAP was changed from 5 to 45 days; Hector H. would like to push out Site Characterization from December 21, 2010 to March 21, 2011. Hector anticipates this site will parallel UST 19. Hector had a meeting with Eric Nuzie of FDEP and conveyed that requirements in the petroleum regulations are being followed.

UST 25

The time frame for review of the Draft Final RAP was changed from 5 to 60 days to include the Navy's review and response, Hector H. requested pushing the additional site characterization to the end of January.

Building 782

Greg C. submitted the groundwater monitoring report to Dave G. in July 2010. The quarterly monitoring for lead in wells that had exceedances will continue.

Building 1917

Quarterly monitoring for natural attenuation is being conducted and Greg C. believes the contract has been awarded to Aerostar. The groundwater monitoring report was received by FDEP September 3, 2010, and the time frame for their review will be changed to a new due date of December 15, 2010. Quarterly monitoring began in November 2010 and Greg C. has 5 years projected for time frame to NFA.

Building 2270

The Utility Department has finally funded the project and Dave G. expects to see SAR sometime during 2011.

Building 3644

A groundwater monitoring report was sent to FDEP with MNA as the recommendation and an onboard review is being conducted. It is currently going through contracts and is being handled by Troy.

Seawall Site (Building 38)

Patty W. put in sole source for Aerostar to conduct the work, but she is still waiting for the contract to be awarded.

19. UST Site 18 Treatability Study (10:45-11:28 am)

Boris Dykin gave a presentation via phone.

Based on the site conditions it was concluded that the oxygen demand is too high for aerobic approach (site anaerobic) and that denitrification can proceed without oxygen. The main goal of DBB was to determine if denitrification is viable for groundwater remediation at Site 18 and secondary goal was to determine if existing biodegradation processes at Site 18 are practical/applicable. Essentially the plume is on the west side of the runway with 2 main hotspots designated the southern and northern plume (a little larger). The denitrification test was set up in wells in both plumes for using mainly nitrate with a little nitrite. Monitoring wells MW-PS9S and GS07 were the treatment points and approximately 130 gallons of N blend was added to each well. Background

wells were chosen in each area including Monitoring Well GS29 in northern plume and Monitoring Well GW30 southern plume where no agent was added. After agent was added to the test wells, biotrap samplers were deployed in study wells. Samplers were allowed to sit for 60 days, and were then sent to Microbial Insight for DNA analysis.

The samplers contained special media and were baited with ^{13}C isotope to differentiate from background hydrocarbons. ^{13}C xylene was used as a marker as it was the main COC. Accumulated biological matter and CO_2 were analyzed for presence of ^{13}C to prove and quantify bio-degradation. The test results indicated: biotrap samplers had vigorous biodegradation of petroleum compounds in both amended and un-amended wells, ^{13}C xylene was incorporated into biomass and CO_2 was a clear indicator of biodegradation of xylenes, the N-blend significantly activated the denitrifying bacteria population, the measured biodegradation rates were similar to published literature, BTEX concentrations in all monitoring wells with elevated levels are on a downward trend, and amended wells demonstrated similar levels of biodegradation when compared to un-amended wells.

The Biotrap results in Figure 1 show ^{13}C enriched biomass vs. total biomass with enriched having considerably higher values. Figure 5 shows the amount of CO_2 generated and Figure 3 shows the loss of xylene. The test conclusion were: the study indicated vigorous degradation of BTEX and that nitrification played a part, but that natural biodegradation is also occurring at similar levels of intensity. Use of natural biodegradation may be more advantageous than using amendments such as N-blend.

Dave G. asked based on the degradation rates in un-amended wells what time frame do we expect MNA to get concentrations below GCTLs? Boris responded that it appears it will get to NADC levels in a year or two, going below GCTLs hasn't been calculated but he could extrapolate for a ball park estimate. Dave G. said rates can be plugged into "bioscreen model" which can develop some sort of time frame to meet NADC or GCTLs. He would also like to see a sensitivity analysis to give him an idea of whether or not a small change in degradation rate will blow up time frames. Boris said the analysis can be performed; he ventured the guess that there will be less variability to reach NADC but little greater sensitivity to reach GCTLs. Gerry W. said the sensitivity analysis and bioscreen model will be incorporated into the RAP that will be sent out in the next couple of weeks.

20. New Bronson Field Sites (11:28-11:50 am)

Gerry W. provided a presentation on IR Sites 103, 104 and 105. The presentation is attached. OLF Bronson is approximately 950 acres, active from 1942-1950 and is now currently the Blue Angels recreational park. In January 1992, 8-10 petroleum sites were identified and all designated Site 15. Two MMRP were identified at OLF Bronson located south of the airfields. Two ERN sites, fire fighting training area and the machine gun butt area, and both received NFA. Site 103 is the flight line area and is one of two fuel distribution systems that included five steel USTs that supplied AVGAS to 5,500 ft pipeline and 56 service pits. All the USTs were removed but not the pipeline and there were two additional 300 gal USTs for lube and used oil. All pits are still visible. Site 104 is a former hanger and includes building 1103 and 1104 and is adjacent to runways to 9 and 18. Solvents, degreases, fuel oils etc were used at the hangers. Site 105 is currently still being used as a parts yard, no historic information exists on this site.

Patty W. will fund the sites 1st quarter of fiscal year (approximately in February 2011). There will be a UFP-SAP DQO meeting scheduled. Dave G. asked if PA's have been done, Gerry W. said they were done January 1992. Dave G. suggested that since EPA is not involved we could do it more Florida 62-780/62-777 FAC type assessment without the risk assessment and default to the State's numbers. Gerry W. liked the idea proposed by Dave G. and plans to go down that road and make the decision at DQO meeting. EPA will be invited to the DQO meeting to see if they want to be involved in the site. Patty W. asked Greg F. if it would be difficult to have EPA to send letter or email saying they would not like to be involved since the site is not on NPL list. Greg F. said a letter would not mean a whole lot and that EPA is not funded for non-NPL sites. It was decided that EPA would be invited to the DQO meeting and have them send email saying they don't wish to be involved. At this point, if we proceed with 62-780 there wouldn't be a risk assessment. Greg F. suggested going forth with 62-780. The only downfall that Dave G. saw was that when we get to the remedy stage the State allows certain cleanups under 62-780 that EPA will not allow under Superfund sites. Gerry W. proposed that it would be discussed at the DQO meeting and EPA can decide whether or not they wish to be involved.

21. Facility Update (11:50-11:58 am)

Greg C. provided update. He wanted to get Team approval for Site 38 that any soil removed from the site has to be characterized and disposed of properly and that any dewatering on site has to be pumped into pumper truck, tested and disposed of. The work plan will be written by the facility and Greg C. will send the plan to the Team via email for their review and comment.

Greg C. hasn't been involved in the BP deep horizon cleanup process, but oil is being found along the facility at depth and tar balls continue to wash up on the beach. Divers have determined the spill area and the contaminated sediment will be removed. Dave G. asked where contaminated sediments will be stored. Greg C. will look into it and keep the Team updated.

22. Lunch (11:58 am -1:33 pm)

23. UST 25 Touch N Go Update (1:15-2:40 pm)

Hector H. gave presentation on UST 25.

UST Site 25

Installation of the sentry well took place last Wednesday. Groundwater flow is to the south, southeast. The synoptic round of sampling conducted in December 2008 indicated that petroleum products were the typical constituents. The two COCs are naphthalene and isopropyl benzene both present at concentrations in exceedance of NADCS in monitoring wells MW-15 and MS-19. Monitoring well MW-26 was installed to the south and screened from 5-15 ft below land surface. Moving forward monitoring well MW-26 needs to be surveyed, a synoptic groundwater sampling event including the new well and sampling of all 25 wells for VOCs, PAHs and TRPH in addition to Natural Attenuation Indicator Parameters in monitoring wells MW-3, MW-11, MW-13, MW-15, MW-18, MW-19, MW-20 and MW-26. The data will be included in the RAP addendum. Hector H. would like to get consensus from the Team. Dave G. wanted to look at a map with all

25 wells shown and a groundwater contamination plume outlined. The proposed monitoring well sampling will essentially be in a line heading north to south and will help with consideration of the monitored natural attenuation.

Consensus 05 Partnering Team reached consensus to conduct synoptic round of potentiometric gauging of which includes sampling of all site wells (25 total) for VOCs, PAHs, and TRPH. Select wells MW-3, MW-11, MW-13, MW-15, MW-18, MW-19, MW-20 and MW-26 will be sampled for NAIPs this round will serve as baseline for 4 quarterly sampling events. Analytical results will be incorporated into the RAP addendum that will include a Natural Attenuation Monitoring Plan as an Appendix. Recommendations for subsequent sampling events will be made in RAP addendum.

Site 19

There are four sampling intervals based on the site lithology. At approximately 80 ft bls there appears to be thick marine clay, the thickness of which is unknown. The source area groundwater samples indicated benzene was present above NADCs, but much less than the historic numbers. Discussions with FDEP are ongoing and related to the vertical and horizontal extent of contamination. A DPT sampling plan has been implemented.

A-141210 Dave G. will send the Team the PQL table

A Geoprobe with stainless steel screens will be used to collect groundwater samples from depths of 36-40', 56-60', 74-80' and 80+ foot bls. CH2M Hill is performing the work this weekend and Hector H. would like to get agreement from the Team as a courtesy on the proposed 24 DPT locations. Hector H. wants to collect a macro core to determine how thick marine clay layer is. The proposed sampling locations will flank contaminated areas and assist in delineation of plume. The source area and leading edge of plume are areas designated for treatment i.e. air sparging. Dave G. stated that DPT rig is horrible for collecting confirmatory samples. DPT is a snapshot in time, water level measurements can't be collected from a DPT grab sample point. Hector H. responded that permanent wells will be installed after screening data from DPT is returned. Dave G. said DPT doesn't give him a good idea of aquifer hydraulics in each zone. Dave G. also stated that he has yet to see contaminants to go after in source area. Dave G. asked how can we get additional information in wetlands. Hector H. responded that there are existing shallow monitoring wells that sampled in 2008, but currently the area is under water. Hector H. has asked field crew to bring waders to perform a synoptic survey. Dave G. gave a conditional agreement and would like to see benzene, xylenes and an isopropyl benzene plume map in different colors overlain over proposed DPT locations. There is the possibility that the plume from Site 24 could be comingling with this plume, especially in the deeper zones, but the shallow contamination is coming from the site. The work plan specifies that the DPT locations will be stepped out using the DPT to collect samplings until clean has been attained. Sustainability is a major component to site cleanup.

24. Break (2:41 pm-2:54 pm)

25. OU 2 Update (2:54 pm- 3:48 pm)

Sam N. gave presentation. Until the data comes back from Radium 226 analysis, excavation has been halted. At site area 30A, floor sidewall samples and one floor sample were collected. No exceedances of FDEP standards were detected so the site can be excavated two feet bls in a 40x40' area. Dave G. pointed out that BEQ calculations were incorrect and could be closer to the residential number. At site area 30B the floor sample had an exceedance for dieldrin, but SPLP was non-detect. In a sidewall sample cadmium had a exceedance, but was non-detect in step out sample collected 10 feet further. Chromium was also detected and was non-detect in step out sample collected 10 feet away. BEQs were in exceedance, but were non-detect in step out sample 10 feet away. The historical groundwater hits are cadmium, chromium, and dieldrin. Sam N. will double check BEQ calculations.

The well southeast of the area doesn't have historical cadmium or chromium exceedances. Sam N. asked if the excavation can be defined by 40x40', Dave G. proposed 50x50' because leachability can't be discounted and there is no well in area. Team agrees to an excavation are of 50x50'. At site area 30C there is no BEQ issue. The characterization for waste disposal, failed TCLP for lead; however lead is not a COC. The site is confined on all four sides by an asphalt cover. Total lead was non-detect in the floor sample, one sidewall sample, Sample SW-3, had an exceedance but the field crew was unable to step out any further due to the asphalt. A 40x40' excavation is proposed, but the soil will have to be designated as hazardous. Frank L. suggested collecting additional samples between the floor and the sidewall to limit the amount of waste that will have to classified as hazardous. Patty W. asked if whole area could be paved since there are a lot of utilities in the area. Dave G. asked to see if there is a figure that shows just the roads and unpaved areas. Dave G. is concerned there may be more contamination in the area to have caused TCLP sample to fail.

In site area 30D, chromium was in exceedance in the floor sample, but it passed SPLP. Dieldrin also passed SPLP. In sample SW-1, chromium exceeded leachability criteria and it took two step outs to obtain a non-detect measurement. Dieldrin in samples SW-1 and SW-2 were still above leachability criteria even with two sets of step outs. In samples SW-3 and SW-4 chromium was still in exceedance after two step outs. Chromium was not identified as a COC when the data gap well was analyzed, however a request can be made to the lab to obtain the information on the existing sample. Dieldrin is not leaching from floor based on historical data and chromium was not detected in down gradient wells. Greg F. stated he was good to stay with 40x40' excavation. Dave G. stated he cannot accept that a soil area does not have groundwater contamination based on a well that is 100 ft down gradient. If SPLP analysis is completed on a soil sample and results are less that GCTLs, that should show soils are not contaminated such that they will contribute to groundwater contamination.

At site area 30D, sidewall sample 1-1 is still at the lab and will have SPLP analysis completed for dieldrin. At site area 30E, the floor sample for dieldrin passed SPLP, side wall sample SW-1 was stepped out three times to obtain a clean sample, sample SW-2 indicated exceedances for chromium or dieldrin even after three step outs. Dave G. said that if sample SW-2 passes SPLP for chromium the area will be okay. Dieldrin is okay based on the groundwater sample (the well is right in the middle of the source area). The site area 30E sidewall will be sampled for chromium via SPLP method. Dave G. asked if the well had been sampled for chromium, Sam replied no. The Team agreed that the

monitoring well sample will be analyzed for chromium instead of running SPLP on sidewall soil samples.

The site area 30F sidewall soil sample failed SPLP analysis for chromium and the data gap monitoring well sample showed no detections for dieldrin. The data gap well sample will be analyzed for chromium instead of running SPLP on sidewall samples soil samples. Sam N. asked that if the chromium concentrations in the groundwater are below GCTLs, can they stay with the planned 40x40' excavation? Dave G. said yes. If there are exceedances, then they will need to expand out with sidewall samples. The site area 30G floor sample had dieldrin exceedance, but passed SPLP analysis. Detected chromium concentration exceeded standards in the initial sidewall samples, but was non-detect in the first step out. Dave G. said that if the data gap monitoring well sample comes up clean for chromium, then the site is okay; If not, Sam N. will have to do step outs for soils.

26. Corry Station Update (3:48 pm-4:07 pm)

Gerry W. presented the update. There are three separate sites being investigated at Corry Station. Site 2 is a supposed landfill under a building based on stained soils observed during foundation borings, no remedial actions have taken place. Site 3 is a pipeline system. Site 4 is a petroleum spill from the 1950s. Dave G. pointed out the well field that supplies NAS Pensacola with drinking water, which is already being treated, could make the site more dynamic by creating an induced downward gradient. Gerry indicated that based on the completed DPT soil investigation there are no indications that Site 2 is a landfill. No detections in the soil samples collected above the water table; however the high FID values in the smear zone could indicate contaminated groundwater. Based on preliminary soils data no monitoring wells will be installed associated with Site 2. The UFP-SAP decision criteria states that if there is no indication of landfill materials or any soil exceedances at Site 2, monitoring wells will not be installed. However wells will be installed to serve as down gradient wells for Site 4. This will limit sampling groundwater for petroleum constituents only. Dave G. asked if the fuel tanks in tank farm area have been closed per FDEP regulations. Gerry W. stated it is not conclusively known, but that monitoring wells are going to be installed down gradient of tanks.

Greg F. reiterated that EPA will not be involved in the assessment or remediation of the NAS Pensacola Outlying Landing Fields. He said the reason why EPA is not involved in Saufley Field, Corry Station or OLF Bronson is because they are not physically part of NAS Pensacola (which is on NPL list) so therefore not considered NPL sites.

27. Parking Lot Bronson Field 1107 (4:07-4:38)

Deep contamination is assumed to be Bunker C. and groundwater flow is toward the northwest. Large diameter augers were used to remediate the onsite soils. WRS asked for NFA based only on three wells sampled located north of the source area for a one year period. No groundwater samples were collected from the product source and treatment area. The question is should the Navy get an RMO2 for soil and groundwater? According to the WRS report, contaminated soil was left in place and there is not a monitoring well in the source area. Dave G. indicated that FDEP would normally want

multiple years of sampling data, but might be able to live with collecting samples from only monitoring wells MW-9 and MW-10 because they are more representative of down gradient wells. Gerry W. said Site 1120 at Bronson has some funding left and the Navy could shift existing funding to sample the additional wells. One concern is if a UFP SAP is required. The UFP SAP may not be required if the scope of work specifies confirmation sampling only.

A-161210 Gerry W. and Patty M. will send Dave G. email on plan for Bronson Field Site 1107.

28. 2nd Day Meeting Closeout – Review Action Items/Consensus Items/Meeting Schedule/Next Agenda/plus-delta/Facilitator Evaluation (4:38 – 4:42 pm)

- Reviewed Action Items
- Reviewed Consensus Items
- Agenda is critiqued
- Team completed a meeting evaluation

Plus +

Meeting Location

Very good OU2 discussion

Delta Δ

Meeting room temperature fluctuations

Allison and Brian weren't present

Weather not sunny Florida

Facilitator Feedback

Stephanie C. reviewed items she will include in her report to Tier II. The Tier II Team has requested that facilitators complete a more detailed report of Team interactions.

The next teleconference is scheduled for January 10, 2011 from 10:00 - 11:00.

Next meeting February 22 and 23rd, 2011 Pensacola subject to change.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 4:42 pm.

- *Consensus Item 01: The Team approves the Final SMP without changes.*
- *Consensus Item 02: A working Gantt chart, based on the SMP, will be maintained for the Team and updated at each Partnering Team meeting.*
- *Consensus Item 03: SMP time extensions can be requested and approved via email.*
- *Consensus 04: The September 22 and 23, 2010 meeting minutes have been approved after amended with editorial comments and changes.*
- *Consensus 05: Partnering Team reached consensus to conduct synoptic round of potentiometric gauging of which includes sampling of all site wells 25 total for VOCS, PAHS and TRPH. Select wells MW-3, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20 and 26 will be sampled for NAIPs this round will serve as baseline for 4 quarterly sampling events. Analytical results will be incorporated into Rap addendum that will include a Natural attenuation monitoring plan as appendix. Recommendations for subsequent sampling events will be made in RAP addendum.*

New Action Items from September 22 & 23, 2010 Meeting

| Action Item No. | Responsible Party | Status | Due Date | Action Item |
|-----------------|-------------------|--------|---------------------|--|
| A-030910 | David G. | | 10/1/10 | Site 1107: David G. will investigate if more recent/current data is needed before an SRCO can be approved. |
| A-080910 | Helen | | Before next meeting | Tier II: Helen will send the guidance and meeting minutes discussed during the Tier II update to the Team for their reference. |

New Action Items from November 29 & December 1, 2010 Meeting

| Action Item No. | Responsible Party | Status | Due Date | Action Item |
|-----------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|---|
| A-011210 | Greg C | | When available | Will provide work plan for repairing damaged sewer line at OU11 Site 38 to eliminate parking lot flooding. |
| A-021210 | Gerry W and Patti W | | 12/10/10 | Will write an additional extension letter for Site 46 PP and submit to regulators. |
| A-031210 | Gerry W | Completed | 12/1/10 | Will email out final SMP. |
| A-041210 | Dave G and Greg F | | 12/10/10 | Will approve final SMP and approve an additional extension letter for Site 41 FS. |
| A-051210 | Patti W | | 12/15/10 | Will look at what has been submitted by Aerostar and determine what is missing and submit to Dave G and Greg F will review. |
| A-061210 | Patti W | | Ongoing | Will send Aerostar emails to Gerry to add to his "Roses are Red" emails. |
| A-071210 | Gerry W | | 12/30/10 | Will determine what is happening with SRCO for Site 1107 |
| A-081210 | Gerry W | | 12/8/10 | Will send Draft SAR Addendum for UST Site 2 Building 2662 to Patti |
| A-091210 | Dave G | | Before next meeting 2/22/11 | Will review/comment on SRCO request for Bronson Field 1120. |
| A-101210 | Greg C | | 12/15/10 | Will add RAB members to the Blue Angels List. |
| A-111210 | Gerry W | | 12/15/10 | Will send the Team the draft December 2010 meeting minutes and the Final approved September 2010 meeting minutes. |
| A-121210 | Patti W | | 12/15/10 | Will update Dave G regarding UST Site 15 Bronson 1159 regarding the effluent flow rate for the treatment system. |
| A-131210 | Gerry W | | 12/15/10 | Will set up conference call in the next 2 weeks with Patti W and Dave G to discuss UST Site 22. |
| A-141210 | Dave G | | 12/8/10 | Will send the PQL table to the Team. |